A 675

# DIALOGUE

BETWEEN A

## Pædo-Baptist,

AND AN

## Anti-Pædo-BAPTIST:

Containing the Strength of

## ARGUMENTS

Offered on both sides at the

## *Portsmouth* Disputation:

WITH

The Addition of a few more Arguments, then ready to be offered in Vindication of *Infant-BAPTISM*.

By *Samuel Chandler*, and *William Leigh*.

LONDON: Printed for *A. Chandler*, at a Glover's Shop [illegible] the *White-Hart-Inn*, in *Aldersgate-Street*; and sold by *A. Baldwin*. 1693.

BRITISH MUSEUM

# TO THE READER.

*BEcauſe Dr.* Ruſſel, *or ſome* Friend *of his, did a while ſince diſgrace the Preſs, with ſome ſcraps of their* Narrative, *ſtuff'd with Nonſenſe and Partiality; nay, and by its Title did delude the Vulgar with an Imagination, that it contained the true State of the* Portſmouth Diſputation; *and the ſame, how Unjuſt ſoever, being Cheap, hath been ſcatter'd throughout moſt parts of the Kingdom: Therefore by Advice of our Brethren, from various Parts, we have offered (ſo far as this ſmall Tract would admit) the ſtrength of Arguments then urged on both Sides, omitting Names and Perſonal Reflections, apprehending this way may be moſt Grateful to Perſons ſeriouſly Inquiſitive. We have alſo annex'd a few Arguments, which with others, were then ready to be urg'd, had the Company's Satisfaction requir'd, and the approaching Evening, admitted.*

# To the Reader.

*If this fall into the hands of the Learned, we requeſt them to remember, That it is deſigned for Perſons of meaner Capacities, that neither underſtand, Ornaments of Speech, nor affect Terms of Logick.*

*If it fall into hands more Illiterate, yet willing to receive Divine Truths, we requeſt of them, that they would weigh it in the Balance of Scripture and Sanctified Reaſon; yea, and we requeſt of God, that they may.*

Sam. Chandler,

Will. Leigh.

QUEST.

# QUESTION I.

*Whether, according to the Commiſſion of our Lord and Saviour* Jeſus Chriſt, *Adult Believers only, are the Proper Subjects of Baptiſm, and not Infants? Aſſerted by* Anti-pædo-Baptiſts.

THE Controverſy is, Whether Chriſt's Miniſters ought (1.) To deny Baptiſm to the Infants of profeſſed Chriſtians. (2.) To Baptize thoſe at Mature Age, who by vertue of deſcent from profeſſed Chriſtians, were Baptized with a ſmall quantity of Water, in Infancy?

The firſt Argument offer'd at the Diſputation by the *Anti-pædo-Baptiſts*, I conſider laſt, becauſe there it will come to be more fairly Anſwered.

*Anti-pædo-Baptiſt.* I prove then, That no Infants can be the Subjects of Baptiſm according to *Chriſt*'s Commiſſion.

*Argument* 1. No Infants can be made Diſciples by the Miniſtry of Men; therefore no Infants can be the Subjects of Baptiſm, according to Chriſt's Commiſſion, *Mat.* 28. 19. *Go teach*, &c. (or, *Diſciple*) *all Nations*, &c.

*Pædo-Bapt.* I deny your whole Argument; and (1.) I aſſert, If they could not be made Diſciples by the Miniſtery of Men, yet this Text would not exclude them from Baptiſm.

Baptism. And then, (2.) I assert, That they be made Disciples by the Ministery of Men.

*Anti-Pæd.* Christ puts Teaching before Baptism; therefore it goes before, and consequently Infants are Excluded.

*Pædo-Bapt.* This is a weak way of Arguing. The word is placed before in Scripture, therefore the thing signified must go before. Were this true, then Baptism must go before Confession of Sin in the Adult, because it's said, *They were Baptized, Confessing their sins.* Mat. 3. 6. Nay, Sanctification and Preservation in *Christ*, must go before Calling, *Jude* 1. But the contrary is evident to all.

But farther, Infants may be Disciples, and therefore, by your own Argument, may be Baptized; they may be Taught in their Parents, as well as the *Kohathites* keep the Charge of the *Sanctuary* in their Parents, from a Month old, *Numb.* 3. 28. Or *Levi* pay Tithes in *Abraham*, *Heb.* 7. 9. Or the *Israelites* in *David*'s time rejoice in their Ancestors on the Banks of the *Red Sea*, *Ps.* 66. 6. *There did we rejoice.* &c. *i. e.* as considered in our Parents.

*Anti-Pæd.* But how can this be by the Ministery of Men?

*Pædo-Bapt.* (1.) By the Preaching of Men, Parents may be constrain'd to resign their *All* to God, and so their Infants. (2.) They are immediately Discipled by Men's Ministery, when Parents and Ministers concur in their Solemn Dedication to God by Baptism.

*Anti-Pæd.* But Teaching and Learning, make the Relation between Master and Scholar.

*Pædo-Bapt.* The contrary is most true; the Master doth care for and command; the Scholar is subject, in order to Instruction; and Resignation of the Scholar, or his Parents for him, and Acceptance of the Master, constitutes the Relation; and by virtue hereof, the Scholar is as much obliged to submit to his Master, according to his Capacity, before he touches a Book, as when he hath learned Seven Years. If Teaching were the ground of this Relation, then Persons long since Dead, might be our Governors. *Job* 8. 8, 10. *The former Age, and their Fathers shall teach thee.* Nay the Beasts of the Field may be our Masters too, *Job* 35. 11. *Who teacheth us more than the Beasts of the Earth*, &c.

We

We may learn of them, and yet be our own Governors? But *Christ*'s Disciples are resigned to him, in order to their being both Governed, Taught, and Disposed of by him, according to their Capacity.

*Anti-Pæd.* Argum. 2. *Paul* did declare the whole Counsel of God, and yet did never declare the Baptism of Infants; therefore Infant-Baptism is no part of the Counsel of God.

*Pædo-Bapt.* Neither ever did *Paul* declare, That the Baptism of Believers Children ought to be delay'd, till they can Personally profess their Faith; therefore thir Practice being such, is no part of the Counsel of God. Take the Argument to your self, and make the most of it.

2. But I hope to prove Infant-Baptism from *Paul*'s Words. 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Rom.* 11. But pray, Is nothing part of the Counsel of God, but what stands on Record as delivered by *Paul*?

*Anti-Pæd.* Nothing; and therefore not Infant-Baptism?

*Pædo-Bapt.* If nothing, then how great a part of the History of the Old World, of the succeeding Patriarchs, of the Ceremonial Law, of Prophecies, Gospel-History, and other Sacred Matters in Holy Writ, is no part of the Counsel of God?

The Truth therefore is, *Paul* might declare Infant-Baptism an hundred times, in his vast number of Sermons and Pious Discourses, and yet the *Holy Ghost* might not see fit to insert it, as delivered by him, this Doctrine being sufficiently Established in other *New-Testament* Texts.

But farther, These words were spoken to the Church of *Ephesus*: And all that remains on Record of what he spake to them in two Years, *Acts* 19. 9, 10, 11. is but the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, and this in *Acts* 20. And dare any say, That he never declared it to them, because it's not herein contained.

* *See our Account p.* 70, 71. *for further Answer.*

Here, because some *Anabaptists*, from Dr. *Russel*'s false Narrative do report, That we pretended at the Disputation, that six Leaves of *Paul*'s Writings containing Infant-Baptism, may be lost, therefore

we

we will (tho otherwise 'twere impertinent) give a true representation of that Matter. The Doctor's weak Evasions, did force us to make our Answers evident beyond all Contradiction: And thus we Argued. If there were a Controversy, whether such an Author did use such an Expression, and his Writings were produc'd, if six Leaves of these Writings were lost, none could determine that he had no such Expression, because it might be contained in those six Leaves. The Controversy is, Whether *Paul* ever did by Preaching, Writing, or Discourse, declare Infant-Baptism. We cannot say we have all his Writings; we dare say, we have not the Hundredth part of his Sermons and Discourses: Who can then determine, that he never did any way declare Infant-Baptism to these *Ephesians*.

*Anti-Pæd.* Arg. 3. *Christ*'s Commission doth *expressly* shew, who are to be Baptized: But it doth not *expressly* shew that Infants are to be Baptized: Therefore Infants are not to be Baptized.

*Pædo-Bapt.* 1. Pray take your Argument back again, and get rid of it as well as you can. *Christ*'s Commission doth *expressly* shew, who are to be Baptized: But it doth not *expressly* shew, That Adult Persons, if Baptized in Infancy, are to be Baptized again: Therefore Adult Persons, if Baptized in Infancy, are not to be Baptized again. But,

2. I deny that Infants or Adult Persons, are distinctly expressed in *Mat.* 28. 19. for both are included in the word *Nations*.

*Anti-Pæd.* But the Commission doth express Disciples; Baptizing them, *i. e.* Disciples. The *Greek* word for *Nations*, is of the *Neuter Gender*, and the word for them, is *Masculine*; therefore Disciples being *Masculine*, must be understood. *

* *See our Account pag.* 74.

*Pædo-Bapt.* 1. If they must be Understood; then they are not Express'd. You have confuted your self.

2. But I assert, That *them*, tho Masculine, may refer to *Nations*, tho *Neuter*. For Instance, Let the Learned see *Acts.* 15. 17. *Acts.* 21. 25. and elsewhere. The *Greek* informs a School-boy the Reason hereof.

*See our Account.*

3. But

3. But ſuppoſe Diſciples were underſtood, I have proved, That Infants may be Diſciples, in anſwer to your firſt *Argument*, and ſhall yet more fully do it, when I take the Opponency.

*Anti-Pæd.* But, *Mark* 16. 16. Believers are the only Subjects of Baptiſm; therefore Infants are not.

*P. Bapt.* The Text ſays no ſuch thing: And if it did, Infants may as well be Believers, imputatively in their Parents, as the *Kohathites* Infants keep the Charge of the *Sanctuary*, or *Levi* pay Tithes in *Abraham*, *Num.* 3. 28. *Heb.* 7. 9.

*Anti-P.* I deny that the Parent's Faith was ever imputed to the Child.

*P. Bapt.* Parents Faith may be imputed to Infants, for their enjoying external Privileges, as well as the Parents coming Corporally, may be imputed to them for *Chriſt*'s Bleſſing, *Mat.* 19. 14. *Suffer little Children to come unto me*, &c. when others (probably Parents) brought them. Yea, the Parents Faith alſo, we find imputed to Infants, *Heb.* 11. 29. compar'd with *Exod.* 14. 22. *By Faith the Children of* Iſrael, (without Limitation) being 600000 Men, beſides Children. (and many Thouſand Children there muſt be) paſſed through the *Red Sea*. All the Children of *Iſrael*, paſſed by Faith; *i. e.* The Faith of Miracles; and therefore Infants, their Parents Faith being imputed to them.

*Anti-P.* But it might be *Moſes* his Faith, not their own.

*P. Bapt.* No, ſee *Heb.* 11. 27, 28. *Moſes* his Faith is expreſſed as diſtinct from theirs, juſt before; and here theirs as diſtinct from his.

*Anti-P.* But why may not the Parents Baptiſm be imputed to Infants, as well as their Faith?

P. *Bapt.* 1. For the ſame reaſon that the Baptiſm of the Iſraelitiſh Parents in the *Cloud* and in the *Sea*, was not imputed to their Infants; *All that were under the Cloud* (and therefore Infants) *were Baptized*, 1 Cor. 10. 1, 2. This was a Type of the Goſpel-Baptiſm.

2. Becauſe Infants are capable of Baptiſm, the Subject being therein Paſſive. But they are not capable of a Perſonal act of Faith; if they were, it would be expected.

But further; You may as well conclude, that no Infant ſhall be Saved, becauſe *Believing* goes before the word [*Saved*], as that no Infant muſt be Baptized, becauſe *Believing* goes before the word [*Baptized.*] But the weakneſs of this Argument, drawn from placing the words, I have ſhewn before.

*Anti-P.* A Perſon already Taught, muſt profeſs his Faith before he be Baptized; therefore an Infant that cannot profeſs his Faith, muſt not be Baptized. Says *Philip* to the Eunuch, *Acts* 8. 37. *If thou believeſt with all*, &c.

*P. Bapt.* This Inſtance ſhews indeed, That an Adult Jewiſh Proſelyte muſt confeſs his Faith before Baptiſm; but neither this, nor any one word of God, doth ſhew, that Infants muſt be deny'd Baptiſm, becauſe they cannot do what is required of Adult Perſons. * This Eunuch was probably a Proſelyte of the Covenant, and therefore a Member of the Jewiſh Church. The Infants of all ſuch Proſelytes (if they had any) were Church-Members with themſelves. Now, muſt theſe poor Infants, immediately upon their Parents Faith and Baptiſm, be ſhut out of God's Church, of which they were Members before, becauſe they make no profeſſion of their Faith, which is impoſſible for Infants to do?

* *See our Account, p.* 73, 74.

*Anti-P.* Arg 4. If the Apoſtles never did Baptize Infants, then the Baptiſm of Infants is not according to *Chriſt*'s Commiſſion.

*P. Bapt.* 1. I ſhall quickly ſhew, that the Scripture doth authorize the practice of Infant-Baptiſm, and thence 'twill follow, that they did Baptize Infants; and they might Baptize Thouſands, tho the Scripture (which contains not the Hundredth part of what they did) doth not expreſly tell us ſo.

2. But this Argument alſo will fall on your ſelves. Thus, the Scripture doth not tell us, that the Apoſtles did deny Baptiſm to any Chriſtian's Infant, or adminiſter it to any Adult Perſon deſcending from a Chriſtian, (tho from the death of *Chriſt*, to the death of St. *John*, was near 60 Years; in which time, Thouſands of Chriſtian Infants muſt become Adult,) Therefore your Practice being ſuch, is not according to Chriſt's Commiſſion.

3. But

3. But we have ſome probable Inſtances of Baptizing Infants: Whole Houſholds were Baptized. I only conſider the Jailor, *Acts* 16. 33. *He and all his were Baptized ſtraitway.* All his, upon his Believing.

*Anti-P.* But all his Houſe Believed.

*P. Bapt.* The Original is, καὶ ἠγαλλιάσατο πανοικὶ πεπιστευκὼς τῷ θεῷ, And he rejoiced in, with, or through all his Houſe, he having believed in God. * Not a word of any believing but himſelf, yet he and all his are Baptized.

* *I refer it to the Learned, whether this be not the faireſt Tranſlation of the Words.*

*Anti-P.* But the Word was Preached to all that were in his Houſe, which of neceſſity ſuppoſeth them able to hear.

*P. Bapt.* 1. No more than thoſe words, *Mark* 16. 15. *Go Preach the Goſpel to every Creature*, ſuppoſeth Stones able to hear, becauſe Stones are Creatures. *All* in one place, and *Every* in the other, is to be underſtood with limitation, according to the Capacity of the Subject.

2. But I add, it might be preached to ſome as included in their Parents. Pray give me the like probable Inſtance for your practice.

*Anti-P.* Chriſt himſelf was the Son of a Believer, yet not Baptized till Adult.

*P. Bapt.* But the Virgin *Mary* was a Jewiſh, not Chriſtian Believer, in *Chriſt*'s Infancy. The very firſt Commiſſion for Chriſtian Baptiſm, was not then given: *Chriſt* himſelf was born a Jew; and we all aſſert, that Jews tho never ſo Pious, ought not to be Baptized, till they profeſs the Chriſtian Faith. *Chriſt*, as to the time of Baptiſm, was not imitable by us: If he were, then none, how Pious ſoever, muſt be Baptized till about Thirty; nor Baptized at all, unleſs Circumciſed at Eight days Old.

*Anti-P.* You demand of us, a prohibition of Infant-Baptiſm; I demand of you a Prohibition of Salt, Cream, Oil and Spittle, ſuch as the *Papiſts* uſe.

*P. Bapt.* When you can ſhew, that theſe are as plainly included in the word [*Baptize*] as Infants are in the word [*Nations*] we ſhall farther conſider what you ſay.

Now according to my promiſe, I conſider the Doctor's firſt Argument, which will fairly introduce the Opponency.

*Anti-P.* Arg. 5. *Christ* hath no where required any of his Ministers to Baptize Infants, therefore the Baptism of Infants, is not according to his Commission.

*P. Bapt.* I assert, *Christ* hath required his Ministers to Baptize the Infants of professed Christians. And now taking the Opponency, I Argue, from *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. *Teach all Nations, Baptizing*, &c.

*Arg.* 1. Those of *Nations* ought to be Baptized, that are not *expresly* or *consequentially* excluded by the word of God; therefore the Infants of Professing Christians ought to be Baptized. You have not been able hitherto to prove them Excluded; therefore my Argument stands good against you.

*Anti-P.* What is not expresly commanded in an Institution, is consequentially forbidden.

*P. Bapt.* 1. Then the Baptism of Adult Persons descending from Christians, not being expresly commanded, is consequentially forbidden.

2. I deny, That all things pertaining to an Ordinance, must be expres'd in the Institution for that Ordinance. The Institution for the Passover doth not expres the Cup, which yet was piously used by *Christ* himself, *Luke* 22. 17. because good Consequence did warrant it. Your selves acknowledge previous Examination and stated Prayer necessary to the right Administration of Baptism, and have recourse to good Consequence for your Warrant: Nay, Consequence it is that doth oblige you to Baptize an Adult Person; you do not count these forbidden, because not expres'd in the Institution, why then should you count Infant-Baptism forbidden, because not expres'd, when we offer good Consequence for it.

*P. Bapt. Arg.* 2. Some Infants are Members of the Gospel-Church Visible, therefore they ought to be Baptized.

*Anti-P.* All Members of the Gospel-Church Visible, are made so by Baptism; therefore, unless you will admit of Re-baptizing, they ought not to be Baptized.

*P. Bapt.* Baptism is the solemn investing Sign; the Infants of Believers, are Church-members before Baptism, but by Baptism, they are publickly owned as such. The Infants of the *Jews*, were Church-members before Circumcision: The *Israelites* while in the Wilderness, tho Uncircumcised,

ciſed, are called the Church, *Acts* 7. 38. Yet they muſt be recognized as ſuch by Circumciſion. A King is King, before he is Crowned, but at Coronation, he is recognized as ſuch.

*Anti-P.* The *Phariſees* were Church-members, yet *John* denies them Baptiſm; therefore Church-membership gives no right to Baptiſm.

*P. Bapt.* Theſe were Members of the Jewiſh Church; ſuch, without credible profeſſion of Faith and Repentance, were not to be Baptized. But we ſpeak of Members of the Chriſtian Church.

*Anti-P.* Infants are not Chriſtian Church-members.

*P. Bapt.* I prove they are, from *Mat.* 19. 14. *Suffer little Children to come unto me, for of ſuch is the kingdom of Heaven.* If by the Kingdom here, muſt be meant the Chriſtian Church * Viſible, then little Children muſt be part of it.

* *Thus the Phraſe is taken*, Mat. 13. 47. 48, 49. *comp. with* v 41. Mat. 11. 11. Mat. 25. 1. Mat. 5. 19.

*Anti-P.* I deny that the Chriſtian Church Viſible, is there meant.

*P. Bapt.* If the Kingdom of Heaven here, ſignify neither the Laws nor Promiſes of the Goſpel, nor the Graces, nor Heaven's Glory, then it muſt ſignify the Chriſtian Church Viſible. But it cannot ſignify either of the former; therefore the laſt, *i. e.* The Chriſtian Church Viſible.

*See our Impartial Account, p.* 22, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40.

*Anti-P.* It ſignifies the Kingdom of Glory.

*P. Bapt.* Then it muſt either ſignify the Happineſs, or Subjects of it. If the Happineſs, then the words muſt run thus; *Of ſuch little Children is the happineſs of Heaven*, which is Nonſenſe. If the Subjects, then the words muſt run thus; *Of ſuch little Children, are the Subjects of the Kingdom of Glory.* Which cannot be, becauſe every Infant that goes to Heaven, immediately upon his Expiration, his Infancy is drop'd, and he enters perfect into Glory. [Here the *Anti-Pedo-Baptiſts* had not a word to anſwer for a conſiderable time, tho the whole Compa-

*See our Account, page* 37, 38.

ny

ny did earneſtly wait for it: And they were provok'd to give it.] At laſt, this Reply was given.

*Anti-P.* This Text hath not a word of Baptiſm in it.

*P. Bapt.* We before proved, That Members of the Chriſtian Church have a right to Baptiſm, and now have proved, That Believers Infants are ſuch Members. The Concluſion is eaſy; therefore ſuch Infants ought to be Baptized.

*Anti-P.* When were any, who were Baptized in Infancy, Excommunicated upon their Apoſtacy, tho ſo many prove Wicked?

*P. Bapt.* We are not diſcourſing how Baptized Perſons ought to be Managed, but who ought to be Baptized. Yet, to anſwer directly, As Infants grow up, their Infant State ceaſeth, and ſo their Infant Church-memberſhip with it: And if, when they become Adult, by vicious Practice they renounce Adult Church-memberſhip, they are no more Church-Members than Excommunicated Perſons: And ſuch need no Excommunication.

*Anti-P.* If Infants without Underſtanding, may be Diſciples by the Miniſtery of Men, the Beaſts of the Field may.

*P. Bapt.* I have ſhewn before, how Infants may be Diſciples, and by the Miniſtery of Men, in anſwering your firſt Argument. Pray ſhew me how Beaſts may; Have Beaſts the Seeds of Reaſon? Are they capable to be Juſtified, Sanctified, Glorified; nay, to keep the Charge of the Sanctuary? Were they fit to be brought to Chriſt for his Bleſſing? But I proceed further to prove them Diſciples.

*See our Account, p. 75, 76, 77.*

*Argum.* 3. The Infants of Believers, are called Diſciples, *Acts* 15. 10. Therefore they ought to be Baptized. *Why tempt ye God to put a yoak upon the necks of the Diſciples*, &c. The Yoak was Circumciſion: Upon Infants as well as others, according to *Moſes* his Law *v.* 5. and Cuſtom *v.* 1. *would they have put this Yoak; therefore Infants, as well as others, are here called Diſciples.

*The Greek word* ζυγὸν, *may well be rendred Cuſtom.*

*Anti-*

*Anti-ped.* Infants cannot be meant, becauſe thoſe that are here called Diſciples, are called Brethren, and ſuch as are Taught.

P. *Bapt.* And if Infants are Church-members, (as I have proved) they are Brethren, and may be taught in their Parents. But (2.) I deny, that all who are here called Diſciples, are called Brethren *v.* 1. or are ſaid to be Taught. Thoſe on whom the Yoak was like to be put, according to *Moſes* his Law, *v.* 5. and Cuſtom, *v.* 1. are here called Diſciples. Now, you know *Moſes*'s Law and Cuſtom, did require the Circumciſing of Infants. Nay, this *Cuſtom*, eſpecially of Circumciſing Infants, is expreſly contended for by Judaizing Chriſtians, *Acts* 21. 21. The word for Cuſtom, is the ſame with that *Acts* 15. 1.

*Anti-P.* But how do you know any Infants were among theſe?

*P. Bapt.* From *v.* 22, 23. which tell us, That the Chriſtians of *Antioch*, *Syria*, and *Cilicia*, (and therefore a great number who muſt have Infants) were concerned in this matter.

*Anti-P.* But *v.* 9. They are ſaid, to have their Hearts purified by Faith.

*P. Bapt.* And cannot God give Infants the Seed of Faith, and purifie their Hearts by ſo doing? May he not purge out old Principles by putting in new? (2.) But thoſe *v.* 9. are the Gentiles of *Cæſarea*, not thoſe at *Antioch*, and therefore not the Diſciples here meant, as the Context will ſhew.

*Anti-P.* But Circumciſion cannot be the Yoak here intended, becauſe Infants did bear Circumciſion; but this neither they, nor their Fathers, were able to bear.

P. *Bapt.* This Expreſſion ſignifies no more, than that it was a very burdenſome Yoak. Thus *Prov.* 30. 21. *For three things the Earth is diſquieted, and for four, which it cannot bear*; and yet you may ſee in the Context, That they are ſuch as the Earth hath born to this day; but it is burdened with them. So *Prov.* 18. 14.

*Anti-P.* But Circumciſion binds to keep the *whole* Law, therefore the *whole* Law is here intended.

P.

*Pedo-Bapt.* Then I am ſure Circumciſion, one of the prime and moſt painful *parts* of the Law, and the only Part particularly mention'd, muſt be intended, and therefore Infants muſt be ſome of thoſe Diſciples on whom they would impoſe this Yoak.

---

# QUESTION II.

## *Whether, according to our Lord's Commiſſion, Baptiſm ought to be adminiſtred by Dipping, Plunging, Overwhelming only, and not otherwiſe?*

*Anti-P.* I Affirm and offer this Argument: *Chriſt* hath appointed it ſo to be Adminiſtred only: Therefore it muſt. I prove this, firſt, from the ſignification of the word Baptize. *Lexicographers*, ſay, it ſignifies to *Dip*.

*P. Bapt.* They ſay, it ſignifies alſo to *Waſh*; and this is the uſual Scripture Senſe of the word: And Scripture is its own beſt Expoſitor. Now, to ſay, it ſignifies to *Dip* in thoſe Texts where the Ordinance is mentioned, and which are eſpecially the Subject of our preſent Controverſy, is but barely to Aſſert, and not to Prove the thing in Queſtion. Therefore let us firſt go to thoſe Places where the Word is mentioned, and the Ordinance not intended, and conſider other Texts afterwards.

*Anti-P.* I ſay, the Scripture Senſe of the word is to *Dip*.

*P. Bapt.* I have Seven Places at hand wherein the word is uſed, and the Ordinance not meant; in none of which is *Dipping* neceſſarily included, (1.) *Mark* 7. 4. *Except they Waſh*,

*Waſh*, (Greek, *be Baptized*) *they eat not*. Were they dip'd over Head and Ears when they did Eat? No, they were zealous for the Traditions and Cuſtoms of their *Elders*, and therefore did imitate their two Great Prophets, *Elijah*, and *Eliſha*. See 2 *Kings* 3. 11. It was *Eliſha*'s Cuſtom, to *pour water on the Hands of* Elijah. Therefore, in all probability, they had Water poured on their Hands. And why may not a Perſon be Baptized with pouring Water on his Face, as well as with pouring Water on his Hands? (2.) In the ſame Verſe, they hold the Waſhing (*Greek*, Baptiſms) ----of Tables, or Beds, κλινῶν. Did they plunge their Tables or Beds into Water? (3.) *v.* 8. Waſhing (*Greek*, Baptiſms) of Cups, *i. e.* from Ceremonial Pollution. Burial is not the thing here intended, but *Waſhing*. And Waſhing the Hands was commonly us'd to cleanſe from Ceremonial Pollution: Therefore *Pilate*, in compliance with the *Jews* Cuſtom, waſheth his Hands, when he would declare himſelf pure from the Blood of *Chriſt*. (4.) *Luke* 11. 38. The *Phariſee* wondred that *Chriſt* had not firſt *Waſhed*: Greek, ἐβαπτίσθη, was not firſt Baptized. Did he wonder, that *Chriſt* was not plunged over Head and Ears before Dinner? The *Greek* word, to a Letter, is the ſame with that *Mark* 1. 9. And pray, why may it not ſignify applying a little Water, in *Mark* 1. 9. as well as in *Luke* 11. 38? (5.) *Heb.* 9. 10. Diverſe Waſhings: (*Greek*, Baptiſms.) Such as thoſe, *Exod.* 30. 19, 20, 21.

*Aaron* and his Sons are bid to Waſh; *i. e.* Their Hands and Feet. *Num.* 19. from the 8th to the 19th. The word in the Original, ſignifies purely to *Waſh*, yet the Apoſtle calls theſe *Baptiſms*. If waſhing the Hands or Feet be Baptiſm, why may not waſhing the Head? (6.) *Baptized in the Cloud, and in the Sea*, 1 Cor. 10. 2. Not Dipped, be ſure, for they went through the Sea as on dry Ground. Is any dipp'd in the Sea, when he hath dry Land under him, and only the droppings of the Rain and Sea upon him. I muſt take liberty to diſſent from the Reverend Author of the Engliſh *Annotations*, in this Matter; I never heard, that βαπτω, much leſs βαπτίζω, did ſignify plunging under

Water, unless the Water were applied, not by drops, but in a great quantity. (7.) Acts 1. 5. *I will Baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with Fire.* Is it proper to say, I will Dip you with the Holy Ghost and with Fire?

*Anti-P.* But *Acts* 2. beginning. The *Holy Ghost* came upon them, and *there came a sound from Heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and filled the house*, &c. So that they were as in a Fish-pond, (says *Causabon*) overwhelmed with the *Holy Ghost*.

*P. Bapt.* But it was the Sound that filled the House: The resemblance of the *Holy Ghost*, were the cloven Tongues of Fire, and certainly they could not be overwhelmed with these. And may not a Man be Baptized with *Water*, when poured on him, as well as with *Fire*, when descending only in *Cloven-Tongues* upon him. Here are seven Places, (and more might be added) where the word is used, and not one of them doth necessarily include Dipping.

*Anti-P.* But it signifies to Dip, in Scripture: *He that dippeth with me in the dish*, Mat. 26. 23.

*P. Bapt.* The word there is βάπτω, not βαπτίζω: And pray remember, The *Holy Ghost* never expresseth the Ordinance by the word *Bapto*, but always by *Baptizo*.

*Anti-P.* But in those Places where the Ordinance is mentioned, the word must signify to *Dip*; as *Mark* 1. 9. *Christ* was Baptized of *John* in *Jordan*, εἰς, into *Jordan*. He could not be washed into *Jordan*; therefore he must be Dipped. See various places, where εἰς signifies *into*, 1 *Tim.* 1. 15. *John* 3. 17. *Luke* 4. 16.

*P. Bapt.* I shewed before, That the Greek word there for Baptized, to a Letter, signifies in *Luke* 11. 38. *Washing*, and that when applied to the Hands only. And now, whereas you produce three Places, where εἰς signifies *into*, I can produce more than three times three, where it signifies *in*. See *Mat.* 2. 23. *Mat.* 10. 41. *Mark* 3. 16. *Luke* 11. 7. *Mark* 5. 34. &c. Therefore the words may be fairly render'd, He was *Washed* of John *in* Jordan.

*Anti-P.* But compare with this, *Mat.* 3. 16. *Christ, when he was Baptized, went up out of the Water*; therefore he must be *Dipped*.

P.

*P. Bapt.* The Greek Prepoſition for *Out of*, ἐκ, may be render'd *From*: See *Mat.* 24. 31. *Luke* 1. 78, *Mat.* 12. 42. And thoſe words, *Mat.* 3. 16. may be render'd, *Chriſt went up from the Water.*

Now, I offer a fair Paraphraſe of theſe Texts, conſiſtent with our way. *John* Preached in the Wilderneſs near *Jordan*; *Jeruſalem* and all *Judea* came to him, and *Chriſt* among others. The Multitude being ſo great, he goes to *Jordan* (as he did another time to *Enon*) takes a ſtep into the Water; thoſe that are Baptized, do the like, (it being Refreſhing rather than Afflicting in that hot Country.) and there *John* doth *Baptize* or *Waſh* them, by pouring Water on them, and then they go up *out of* or *from* the Water, which alway runs in a lower Place.

This is much more probable, than that *John* or the Apoſtles, *Acts* 2. ſhould *Dip* (according to your way) Hundreds, it may be Thouſands in a day: That Perſon had need have Sinews of Braſs, that could (according to your Cuſtom) bear the weight of, lay down, and raiſe up ſo many in ſo little time: Beſides his Limbs and Body muſt be ſoundly ſoak'd. I am ſure the words will well bear our Senſe. And Probability is much ſtronger on our ſide, than yours.

*Anti-P.* But the *Eunuch* is a clear Inſtance for us, *Acts* 8. 38, 39. They came to a certain Water, went both down into, and came up out of the Water.

*P. Bapt.* This Inſtance doth you not the leaſt Service. The Greek Prepoſitions for *to*, *into*, *out of*, may be render'd fairly, *By*, *To*, *From*. And without the leaſt Violence, the Text may be thus Tranſlated. [They came by a certain Water, and went both down to the Water, and came up from the Water.

*Anti-P.* But could not Water be brought to them in the Chariot, if a little were ſufficient?

*P. Bapt.* Do you think there was convenient room in the Chariot to place themſelves in a praying Poſture, or that they were ſo Irreligious, as not to Pray at all? *See our Account, p.* 81.

*Anti-P.* But Baptiſm doth repreſent a Burial, *Rom.* 6. 4. *Col.* 2. 12. *Buried with him in Baptiſm*, &c. Therefore it muſt be adminiſtred by *Dipping*.

*P. Bapt.* It is one thing to be *Buried with Chriſt in Baptiſm*, and another for Baptiſm to repreſent a Burial. A Perſon is obliged in Baptiſm, to die and be buried with *Chriſt*, to Sin and the World; but it's not neceſſary that Baptiſm ſhould repreſent theſe. In the *Lord*'s-*Supper* we are obliged to this Burial; Doth it therefore follow, that the *Lord*'s-*Supper* muſt repreſent a Burial? (2.) But ſuppoſing, (not granting) that Baptiſm muſt repreſent a Burial, pouring Water on the Face, the moſt remarkable part of the Body, doth repreſent a Perſon's being under Water, and raiſing him up, repreſents the Reſurrection.

*See our Account, p.* 78, 79.

*Anti-P.* This is like burying with a Turf on the Head.

*P. Bapt.* What then? A Perſon may be Buried as well with a Turf on the Head, as *Feaſt abundantly at the *Lord*'s-*Supper*, with a bit of Bread, and a ſup of Wine; a ſmall quantity of the Element is ſufficient for its Sacramental uſe.

* 1 *Cor.* 5. 8. *Cant.* 5. 1.

*Anti-P.* But let us keep ſtrictly to the ſignificancy of a Burial.

*P. Bapt.* Then I am ſure, the Baptized Perſon muſt not go into the Water to his Waſt. Do dead Men walk into the Grave, half bury themſelves, and wait for the *Sexton* to bury their Head and Shoulders?

*Anti-P.* But the whole Body is under Water, when a Perſon is Baptiz'd in our way.

*P. Bapt.* But the Adminiſtrator dips but one half. And, Doth he ſpeak Truth, when he tells the World, that Baptiſm is dipping the whole Body under Water, and that he doth, according to his ſenſe of the Word, Baptize, *i. e.* dip the whole Body under Water, when he dips but one half? And dare he to affix the *Name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt*, to an Untruth? Do you think, *John* the *Baptiſt* and the Apoſtles, did ſo? And if not,

not, then you have not the leaſt Precept or Example, for your Practice. Is our way attended with this Inconvenience?

But further, *Baptiſm* is deſigned to ſignify the pouring out of *Chriſt*'s Blood, Spirit, and Bleſſing; the application of this Blood, which is expreſſed by Sprinkling * to ſignify and excite to a ſubmiſſive frame of Spirit. Is your way ſo well adapted to all theſe ends? Can any be thruſt into the Spirit or Bleſſing of *Chriſt*, or are Perſons like to be ſo Compoſed (ſuppoſing them Adult) when ſtriving for Life, eſpecially in Froſt and Snow, as when a little water only is poured on them?

* *Iſa.* 44. 3. *Heb.* 12. 24. 1 *Pet.* 1. 2.

*Anti-P.* But many Learned *Pædo-Baptiſts* acknowledge, that our way is moſt agreeable to Scripture.

*P. Bapt.* 1. Will you ſtand by the Authority of theſe Men in other Matters? If not, why would you have us in this? (2.) Do any of theſe ſay, that *to Waſh*, is not the *New-Teſtament* ſenſe of the Word? Or, Do they prove us in the Wrong? We take not Men's Opinions upon Truſt, but Tryal. (3.) Who of thoſe Authors have not adhered to that, *Mat.* 12. 7. *I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice*, to juſtify their Baptizing with a little Water in theſe cold Countries. (4.) Will not the Opinion and Practice of your Brethren in *Holland*, argue as ſtrongly againſt you, as the Opinion of theſe Men, had their Practice been Dipping alſo, do againſt us. (5.) Will not the Opinion and Practice of ſo many Thouſand Men, great for Learning and Piety, at this day, argue more ſtrongly for us, than theſe Mens Opinion only, without their Practice, do againſt us.

*Anti-P.* But all you can pretend to for your Way, is Probability; it may be ſo, and it may not.

*P. Bapt.* We acknowledge, The *New-Teſtament* hath not fixed the quantity of Water, and therefore we muſt have recourſe to a Moral Precept, *Mat.* 12. 7. *I will have Mercy, and not Sacrifice*: And this carries us beyond Probability, even to a Certainty; which is this; That we muſt ſo Adminiſter it as ſhall conſiſt with the ſafety

of

of the Subject. *Christ*, *v.* 2, 3. justifies *David*'s eating the *Shew-Bread*, from these words, tho a positive Ritual Law were therein broken. Then certainly *Christ* will justify the Practice of applying a little Water in these cold Countries, where Life might be endanger'd by Dipping, especially when neither Gospel Precept, nor Example, doth in the least oppose us.

Nay, and knowing that *Christ* hath appointed for the strongest Christians, a Sacrament as pleasant as Eating and Drinking, we cannot imagin, that he would appoint one so very sharp, as Plunging in Frost and Snow, for the Weakest.

---

## *I proceed to offer an Argument or two more.*

*P. Bapt.* I Argue from 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Else were Children unclean, but now are they holy.*

*Arg.* The Infants of Believers, are Holy, therefore they have a right to Baptism.

*Anti-P.* Legitimacy is there meant by Holiness, and therefore this doth not entitle them to Baptism.

*P. Bap.* Legitimacy cannot descend from Believers, as Believers, but from Married Persons, as such, whether they believe or no. But this Holiness descends from Believers, as Believers, and therefore it cannot be Legitimacy. (2.) I deny that ever the word Holy is so used in all the *New-Testament*, tho we have it many hundred times, and therefore you force this Sense upon it to serve a Turn. (3.) If Legitimacy were meant, then the Apostle would speak false. The Words would run thus [If the unbelieving Wife be not Sanctified by the believing Husband, your Children would be Bastards.] No, their being Husband and Wife, would secure their Children from

from Bastardy: Nay, and then all the Idolaters and Murderers in the World, if Legitimate, would be Holy.

*Anti-P.* But Holiness is not a ground of Baptism, if it were, then Horses Bells must be Baptized, *&c. Zech.* 12. 20.

*P. Bapt.* When you can shew, that Bells were once Church-Members, that they have Immortal Souls, capable of Pardon, through the Blood and Merits of *Christ*, of going to Heaven, *&c.* then we will baptize Bells too.

*Anti-P.* But Children are Pure, or Holy, as all things else, that a Believer hath, are pure, *i. e.* for Enjoyment. To the Pure all things are Pure.

*P. Bapt.* Then I am sure Legitimacy is not here meant, because, if a Person that hath a Bastard, be Converted and he truly Penitent, that Bastard is also Sanctified to his Enjoyment, because all things are. But you ought to shew, that Pure and Holy are the same; Holy doth imply a dedication to God. But Meat, which the Apostle there speaks of, might be clean, as many Creatures under the Law, which yet were not dedicated to God.

In short, the word *Holy* is taken, as commonly it is in other Places, and it includes a visible separation for God, and Relation to him. Thus the Body of *Israel* * and afterward of a Gospel-Church, are called Holy * in many Places.

* *Deut.* 7. 6.
* 1 *Cor.* 3. 17.

*Arg.* 2. From *Acts* 2. 39. *The Promise is to you, and to your Children*, &c. This Promise the Infants of Penitent Persons have a right to; therefore they have a right to Baptism; *v.* 38. *Be Baptized*, &c.

*Anti-P.* The Context doth exclude Infants from the Promise, and therefore from Baptism. The Promise is confin'd to those that the Lord shall Call.

*P. Bapt.* If twere so, then *Peter* just upon receiving extraordinary Wisdom from Heaven, would speak Impertinently: Whereas, he says, *The Promise is to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even to as many as the Lord our God shall call*: He might have left out their Children, and they would easily have understood, that their Children if once called, should be comprehended

ded in those words, *As many as the Lord shall call.* And farther, supposing your Sense to be true, this Paraphrase may justly be put on the Words: [You grown Jews, and ye Gentiles, when Called, have a right to Church-Privileges; but your poor Infants, who for many hundred Years past have had the same, are now through the gracious efficacy of Christ's Death, strip'd of it, tho they (poor Hearts!) never did the least to forfeit it.] Do you think this would have been a good Plaister for their wounded Hearts? And can we imagine, that neither these, nor any tender Parents of all the Jewish Converts, would have put in the least Plea to God or Man on the behalf of their poor abject Infants; or if they had, that the Scripture would have quite buried it in Silence, when we have their Contests about Circumcising Infants, Recorded?

*Anti-P.* But Children are not impertinently mention'd, for the Jews had brought the guilt of Christ's Blood upon their Children as well as themselves; *His Blood be on us and our Children.* He drops a word of Comfort to them, with relation to these Children.

*P. Bapt.* Yes, all these Children, and therefore their poor Infants, on whom they had brought the Curse, as well as an those of riper Years. Say they, *His blood be upon our children, whom we have a right in, and are concerned for.* This they spake to spit their Venom against Christ. And the Apostle chargeth these Jews with it, v. 23. 36. Now, the Apostle makes the Plaister as broad as the Wound, and assures them, That upon their Repentance, the Promise, and therefore Church-Privileges would belong to their Children, with themselves, even all on whom they brought the Curse.

Supposing the Church-Membership of our Infants, to be the main thing opposed by you, I offer this Argument to prove it.

*Arg.* 3. The Infants of converted Jews were not cast out of God's Church; therefore the Infants of converted Gentiles, are not kept out. I prove that God did

did not caſt out the former, therefore neither doth he keep out the latter.

*Arg.* 1. God did not caſt out thoſe Infants in Judgment to them, nor in Mercy; therefore not at all. Not in Judgment: For, how is it conſiſtent with Infinite Grace to inflict ſo great a Judgment, as deprivation of Church-memberſhip on thoſe who never did the leaſt to Forfeit it themſelves, and whoſe Parents are God's peculiar Favourites? Nor yet in Mercy to thoſe Infants; for how could he in Mercy deprive them of ſo great a Bleſſing * except he gave them a greater in its room? But where's that greater Bleſſing vouchſafed to Infants?

* *The great advantages of Infant Church-memberſhip, ſee in our Account, p.* 8.

2. Not one Privilege of the Covenant of *Grace*, was ever taken away by the death of Chriſt, in whom all the Promiſes were, *Yea* and *Amen*. Therefore the Church-memberſhip of Jewiſh Infants, was not taken away by the Death of *Chriſt*: And if not by his Death then not at all.

I prove, That Church-memberſhip is a Privilege of the Covenant of *Grace*. It muſt be of the Covenant of *Grace*, or of *Works*; but it cannot be of *Works*; therefore it muſt be of *Grace*. No other Covenant but that of Grace, hath ſet up a Church in the World, ſince the Fall of Man, or admitted any into it.

*Anti-P.* Have all Church-Members then a right to the Covenant of *Grace*?

*P. Bapt.* They have a Viſible right to it. We ought ſo in Charity to judge, while they are rightful Members?

None could juſtly Exclude thoſe Jewiſh Infants that were regularly Circumciſed from a viſible Right, to the Promiſes of the Covenant of *Grace*: Becauſe Circumciſion made them Debtors to the whole Ceremonial Law, *Gal.* 5. 3. And God never yet divided the Promiſes from the Precepts of that Law, and theſe together made up the Covenant of *Grace*. Thoſe who are viſibly under the preceptive part of this Covenant, have viſibly a right to the promiſſive part of it. But the Jewiſh Infants were to be manag'd by it, and (as they grew up) obedient to it, and

ſo were under the preceptive part of it. Therefore, &c. Now, if no part of the Covenant of *Grace*, and ſo neither this Privilege, which the Infants of the Jewiſh Converts had, were ever taken away, then ſuch Converts were never caſt out of Gods's Church, upon Chriſt his Death, or their Parents Believing. And from hence We may conclude,

2. That the Infants of Gentile Converts, are not kept out: Becauſe Jews and Gentiles have the ſame Privileges in Chriſt. This, I ſuppoſe, no *Anti-Pædo-Baptiſt* will deny, *Col.* 3. 11.

Other Arguments might be offered, as the Reader may obſerve in the Abridgment of Mr. *Chandler*'s Sermons prefix'd to our *Impartial Account*. But a deſign of Brevity forbids here to add them.

*Anti-P.* But after all, the beſt Arguments you can offer for Infant-Baptiſm, are but Conſequential. Let us have ſomewhat Expreſs.

*P. Bapt.* Shew me where an Adult Perſon is expreſly Commanded to be Baptized.

*Anti-P.* Adult Perſons making a credible profeſſion of Faith, are Diſciples of Chriſt; therefore brought to be Ba zed.

*P. Bapt.* And what is this but Conſequence? Such a one is a Diſciple, therefore, by conſequence, he ought to be *Baptized*. This Argument is convincing.

I add, a Believer's Infant is, in a Scripture ſenſe, Holy; a Church Member hath a viſible right to that Promiſe, *Acts* 2. 39. a Diſciple, therefore he ought to be Baptized. Is not this Arguement as convincing as the other?

Pray, how would you clear up your Right to future Happineſs?

*Anti-P.* I would endeavour to prove myſelf a Believer an Holy Perſon. And finding Eternal Life made over to ſuch, and not finding upon the moſt ſtrict enquiry, one word in all the Book of God, to exclude ſuch from it, I ſhould conclude my right to future Happineſs, unqueſtionable.

P. *Bapt.*

*P. Bapt.* Well then, *I* have proved the Infants of Believers, Holy Persons, Church-Members, Disciples, and this in a Scripture sense; such I have proved entituled to Baptism. And not finding upon the most strict enquiry, one word in all the Book of God, to exclude them from it, I conclude their right to Baptism unquestionable.

Arguments for the Baptism of an Unbaptized Professing Christian, nay, for the true Christian's Salvation, are Consequential, and yet most Convincing. Why then should Arguments for the baptism of Believers Infants be slighted, because Consequential, when they are so many, and so clear from Scripture?

# POSTSCRIPT.

*Reader*,

TO Prevent unjuſt Reflections, our deſign in this *Dialogue*, was not ſtrictly to confine our ſelves to the words of the Diſputation, but to preſent thee with the Strength thereof; therefore ſomething then omitted on both ſides, are here Inſerted, others more intelligibly expreſs'd; and we think nothing of Weight then deliver'd, is here Concealed. And whereas other Arguments here totally paſſed by, might be urged to good Purpoſe; particularly from *Rom.* 11. (ſome Hints of which, are given in our *Impartial Account*, Page 4. Second *Edit.*) We hope, neceſſary confinement to Brevity, will be a ſufficient Excuſe to the Ingenious.

*BOOKS*

# *BOOKS Printed for* Abr. Chandler.

AN Impartial Account of the *Portſmouth* Diſputation; with ſome Juſt Reflections on Dr. *Ruſſel*'s pretended *Narrative*. By *Samuel Chandler*, *William Leigh*, and *Benjamin Robinſon*. With an Abridgment of thoſe Diſcourſes that were the Innocent occaſion of that Diſputation; and an Healing Preface to the Sober *Anabaptiſts*: The Second *Edition*; with a *Poſtſcript*. Price 1 *s*.

The Young Scholar's Guide through the Engliſh to the Lattin or Writing-School: Wherein the Nature and Uſe of Vowels, Conſonants, Diphthongs, *&c.* are demonſtrated by plain Tables; and the Rules for Dividing long Words into Syllables, made uſeful to Children, by ſutable Examples to each Rule; by which, a Child, that hath learned his Letters, may be ſpeedily taught to Read Engliſh Exactly, *&c.* With ſome uſeful Obſervations in *Orthography*. Price Stitch'd, 3 *d*.

Sacramental Diſcourſes on ſeveral Texts, before and after the *Lord's-Supper*. By Mr. *John Shower*.

*Of the Duty of Grace*: Or a Diſcourſe concerning the Poſſibility and fear of its being paſt before Death: Shewing the groundleſs Doubts and miſtaken Apprehenſions of ſome, as to their being finally Forſaken and Left of God: With the dangerous Symptoms and Approaches of others to ſuch a ſad State: In *Four Sermons*; from *Pſalm* 81. 11, 12. By Mr. *John Shower*.